



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,760	11/27/2000	Eduard Michel	1999DE132	4985

25255 7590 01/12/2004

CLARIANT CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
4000 MONROE ROAD
CHARLOTTE, NC 28205

EXAMINER

DOTE, JANIS L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1756

15

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/722,760

Applicant(s)

MICHEL et al

Examiner

J. DOTE

Group Art Unit

1756

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/30/03
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4 - 22 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 11 - 13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4 - 10, 14 - 22 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

1. The examiner acknowledges the amendments to claims 1, 5, 14, 18, 21, and 22 filed in Paper No. 14 on Sept. 30, 2003. Claims 1 and 4-22 are pending.

2. Applicants' election of species without traverse in Paper No. 6, filed on Mar. 5, 2002, has been noted. The examiner has previously acknowledged the elected species, an electrophotographic toner or developer, and the elected ultimate species of invention, distearyldimethyl ammonium bentonite in preparation example 1 on pages 30-31 of the instant specification. See the office action mailed on May 1, 2002, Paper No. 7, paragraph 2.

Pursuant to the amendments to claims 1, 14, 18, and 21, filed in Paper No. 14, instant claims 1, 4-10, and 14-22 read on the ultimate elected species.

Claims 11-13 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 6.

3. The objection to the specification set forth in the office action mailed Jul. 3, 2003, Paper No. 13, paragraph 7, has been

withdrawn in response to the replacement paragraph beginning at page 13, line 11, of the specification, filed in Paper No. 14.

The rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in Paper No. 13, paragraph 9 has been withdrawn in response to the amendment to claim 22.

The rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over US 5,807,629 (Elspass), as evidenced by US 5,385,776 (Maxfield), set forth in Paper No. 13, paragraph 12, has been withdrawn in response to the amendment to claim 22, reciting the step of adding at least one salt of ionic structured silicates "to a binder resin of an electrophotographic toner or developer or of an electret material." Elspass does not teach or suggest adding BENTONE-34, a dialkylammonium montmorillonite, to a binder resin of an electrophotographic toner or developer or an electret as now recited in instant claim 22, but to the binder resin of a dried powder.

4. Applicants are advised that should claim 14 be found allowable, claim 21 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the

other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1, 4-10, 14-18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 14, 18, and 21 recite a structured silicate salt "which contains a low molecular weight organic cation" (emphasis added). The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of said structured silicate salt. The originally filed specification at page 6, lines 2-4, discloses a structured silicate salt wherein the "cation is NH_4^+ , H_2O^+ , an alkali metal, alkaline earth metal, earth metal or transition metal ion or a low molecular weight organic cation or a combination thereof" (emphasis added). The limitation

"contains a low molecular weight organic cation" recited in the instant claims includes not only the low molecular weight organic cation and the other cations disclosed in the specification, but also other cations, such as high molecular weight polymeric organic cations that are not disclosed.

7. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

A thick dark line runs length-wise down the middle of the page 4 of the amendments to the claims. The line obscures part of the chemical formulas disclosed at page 4.

Appropriate correction is required.

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

9. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,807,629 (Elspass), as evidenced by US 5,385,776 (Maxfield).

Elspass discloses a dried powder comprising 72 wt% of a styrene-butadiene rubber binder resin and 28 wt% of a layered material, BENTONE-34, a dialkylammonium montmorillonite, sold by Rheox, Inc. See example 1 at cols. 3 and 4. (The weight percentages are determined from the data in Example 1). Elspass

adds BENTONE-34 to the binder resin dissolved in a solvent. Maxfield identifies BENTONE-34 as a montmorillonite whose native interlayer cations were ion-exchanged for dimethyldioctadecyl-ammonium cation. Maxfield, col. 13, line 34, to col. 14, line 3. The addition of BENTONE-34 meets the limitation of "adding a salt structured silicate which contains a low molecular weight organic cation," as recited in instant claim 18.

ElsPASS does not disclose that the addition of BENTONE-34 imparts, controls, or improves the charge of the powder as recited in instant claim 18. However, as discussed above, BENTONE-34 meets the limitation of a salt structured silicate which contains a low molecular weight organic cation, as recited in instant claim 18. Accordingly, it is reasonable to presume that ElSPASS's addition of BENTONE-34 has the effects recited in instant claim 18. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

(Note that this rejection was previously presented in the last office on the merits, mailed on Jul. 3, 2003, Paper No. 13, paragraph 12, applied to the subject matter recited in claim 22. The rejection of claim 22 has been withdrawn in this office action, as set forth in paragraph 3, supra. However, the amendment to claim 18 filed in Paper No. 14 reinstated the rejected subject matter.)

10. Claims 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent 8-6295 (JP'295) combined with US 3,925,278 (Murai), US 4,992,262 (Nakagaki), and Maxfield. See the Japanese Patent Office (JPO) machine-assisted translation of JP'295 for cites.

JP'295 discloses a charge control agent comprising a composition that comprises the quaternary ammonium salt compound (1) of Table 1 of JP'295 and organic bentonite in a weight ratio of 50:50. Translation, Table 1 at page 6, line 1; and paragraph 0052, charge control agent constituent 4. JP'295 adds the charge control agent to a binder resin of a toner. See the JPO translation, paragraph 0054. The resultant toner comprises a binder resin, a colorant, and the charge control agent comprising organic bentonite. JP'295 discloses that the resultant toner shows stable electrostatic charge performances under conditions of high-humidity and high-temperature, as well as under low-humidity and low temperature. See the translation, Table 2, paragraph 0060, lines 1-4, and paragraph 0061. Thus, the addition of JP'295's charge control agent imparts, controls, or improves the charge of an electrophotographic toner and developer as recited in instant claim 22.

JP'295 does not identify the organic bentonite as distearyldimethyl ammonium bentonite as recited in instant claims 19 and 22. However, the term "organic bentonite" is

usually defined as a bentonite impregnated with a cationic organic compound, such as a quaternary ammonium salt, e.g., dimethyloctadecylammonium bentonite. Murai, col. 1, lines 35-38. Nakagaki discloses that commercially available organic bentonites include BENTONE 27, BENTONE 34, and BENTONE 38. Nakagaki, col. 3, lines 27-29. Maxfield identifies BENTONE-34 as a montmorillonite whose native interlayer cations were ion-exchanged for dimethyldioctadecyl-ammonium cation. Maxfield, col. 13, line 34, to col. 14, line 3. BENTONE-34 is within the limitation of "distearyldimethyl ammonium bentonite" as recited in instant claims 19 and 22.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings of Murai, Nakagaki, and Maxfield, to use the readily commercially available BENTONE 34 as the organic bentonite in the toner disclosed by JP'295, because that person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic toner having stable electrostatic charge performances under conditions of high-humidity and high-temperature, as well as under low-humidity and low temperature, as taught by JP'295.

11. Claims 1, 4-10, 14-18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP'295 combined with

Murai, Nakagaki, and Maxfield. See the JPO machine-assisted translation of JP'295 for cites.

JP'295 combined with the teachings of Murai, Nakagaki, and Maxfield, renders obvious a toner comprising BENTONE 34 and a method of adding BENTONE 34 to the binder resin of the toner, as described in paragraph 10 above, which is incorporated herein by reference. BENTONE 34 meets the limitation of the structured silicate salt containing a low molecular weight organic cation recited in instant claims 1, 4-10, 14-18, 20, and 21.

JP'295 further discloses that its toner comprises the binder resin in an amount of 86.5 wt%, the colorant in the amount of 6.9 wt%, and the charge control agent in the amount of 1.7 wt%, based on the total weight of the toner. The weight percentages were determined from the information disclosed in paragraph 0054 of the translation. As discussed in paragraph 10 above, the charge control agent comprises a 50:50 weight ratio of the quaternary ammonium compound (1) and organic bentonite. Thus, the amount of organic bentonite present in the toner is 0.85 wt%. The amounts of the 86.5 wt% of the binder resin, 6.9 wt% of the colorant, and 0.85 wt% of organic bentonite are within the amount ranges of the binder resin, colorant and the structured silicate salt recited in instant claims 14, 15, 20, and 21.

Thus, as discussed in paragraph 10 above, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of

the teachings of Murai, Nakagaki, and Maxfield, to use the readily commercially available BENTONE 34 as the organic bentonite in the toner disclosed by JP'295, because that person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic toner having stable electrostatic charge performances under conditions of high-humidity and high-temperature, as well as under low-humidity and low temperature, as taught by JP'295.

12. Applicants' arguments filed in Paper No. 14 have been fully considered with respect to the rejections set forth in paragraphs 10 and 11 above but they are not persuasive.

Applicants assert that the JP'295 does not teach that "bentonite can be used as a cation [sic: anion] for distearyldimethyl ammonium" as recited in instant claims 19 and 22. Applicants assert there is no motivation or suggestion in the cited prior art that would lead one with ordinary skill in the art to the conclusion that a distearyldimethyl ammonium bentonite can be used as a charge control agent. Applicants argue that even if "one with ordinary skill in the art combined the references in the manner proposed by the Office, the resultant combination would still fail to yield Applicants' invention . . . substitution of any of the bentonites disclosed by the secondary references in the JP'295 reference would still

yield a composition where a quaternary ammonium salt with a polyacid anion or organic sulfonic acid anion is used as a charge control agent with the bentonite employed as an extender."

However, JP'295 does not teach or suggest that bentonite be used as an anion for its quaternary ammonium salt. Nor did the examiner's reasons in the rejection suggest that bentonite be used as the anion of JP'295's quaternary ammonium salt. Rather, as discussed in the rejection set forth in paragraph 10 above, JP'295 teaches a charge control agent composition comprising the quaternary ammonium salt compound (1) and organic bentonite; and that in view of the teachings of the other cited references, it would have been obvious to use the commercially available BENTONE 34 as the organic bentonite in JP'295's charge control agent composition. As discussed in paragraph 10 above, BENTONE 34 is identified by Maxfield as a montmorillonite whose native interlayer cations were ion-exchanged with dimethyldioctadecylammonium cation (octadecyl is also called stearyl). (As previously discussed in Paper No. 13, paragraph 4, bentonite is identified as sodium montmorillonite. See Grant & Hachk's Chemical Dictionary, fifth edition, page 71, which is of record.) BENTONE 34 is within the limitation of "distearyldimethyl ammonium bentonite" recited in instant claim 19 and 22, and within the limitation of a "structured silicate salt" recited in instant claims 1, 4-10, 14-18, 20, and 21.

Moreover, the instant claims do not recite that the distearyldimethyl ammonium bentonite or the structured silicate salt is a charge control agent. Rather, instant claim 19 recites a "toner or developer comprising distearyldimethyl ammonium bentonite." Instant claims 14, 15, 20, and 21 recite toners comprising "at least one salt of ionic structured silicates which contains a low molecular weight organic cation." As discussed in the rejections in paragraphs 10 and 11, supra, the toner rendered obvious over the combined teachings of JP'295 and the other cited references comprises a binder resin, a colorant, and a charge control agent composition comprising JP'295's quaternary ammonium salt compound (1) and BENTONE 34, which is identified as sodium montmorillonite where the Na cation is replaced with dimethyldioctadecyl cation. Thus, the toner rendered obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art meets the compositional limitations of the toner recited in those claims.

Instant claim 22 recites "a method of imparting, controlling or improving the charge . . . comprising the step of adding a distearyldimethyl ammonium bentonite to a binder of an electrophotographic toner or developer." Instant claims 1, 4-10, and 16-18 recite "a method of imparting, controlling or improving the charge . . . comprising the step of adding a structured silicate salt [claim 18: salt structured silicate] . . . to a binder of an electrophotographic toner or developer."

As discussed in paragraph 10 above, JP'295 discloses that the addition of its charge control agent composition which comprises the quaternary ammonium salt compound (1) and organic bentonite to a toner composition provides a toner with stable electrostatic charge performance under conditions of high-humidity and high temperature, as well as under low humidity and low temperature. In addition, JP'295 discloses that when the extender in the charge control agent composition is not organic bentonite, but aluminum hydroxide, the electrostatic charge performance of the toner comprising said charge control agent composition was not stable under conditions of high-humidity and high temperature and of low-humidity and low temperature. Translation, paragraph 0053, charge control agent constituent 5; Table 2, example 5; and paragraph 0060, lines 1-6. Thus, organic bentonite in JP'295's charge control agent composition controls or improves the charge of the toner as recited in instant claims 1, 4-10, 16-18, and 22.

Moreover, even if the instant claims did recite that the structured silicate salt or distearyldimethyl ammonium bentonite is a charge control agent, as discussed in the rejections, BENTONE 34 meets the limitations of distearyldimethyl ammonium bentonite and of the structural silicate salt recited in the instant claims. "A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical

chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990)." MPEP 2112.01. Accordingly, it is reasonable to presume that BENTONE 34 is a charge control agent. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. Spada, supra.

13. Claims 1, 4, 7-10, 14-18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canadian Patent 2,244,367 (CA'367).

CA'367 discloses a method of controlling or improving the charge of an electrophotographic toner or developer, a powder coating, or an electret comprising the step of adding an "inter-polyelectrolyte complex" (IPEC) to the binder resin of the toner or developer, the powder coating, or the electret. Page 7, lines 4-22. The IPEC comprises a polyanion-forming compound and a polycation-forming compound. Page 8, lines 1-3. CA'367 discloses that the polyanion-forming compound can be hectorite or bentonite from a list of about 61 examples of polyanion-forming compounds. Page 10, line 8. The polycation-forming compound can be a polymeric ammonium salt obtained by homopolymerizing the monomer of formula (1) disclosed at page 11, lines 10-21, n,m-ionenes of the formula disclosed at page 12, line 15, and the poly(viologen)s of the formula disclosed at page 12, line 20,

from a list of about 37 examples of polycation-forming compounds. Hectorite and bentonite meet the limitation of the silicate anion recited in the instant claims. The polymeric ammonium salt, n,m-ionenes, and poly(viologen)s meet the limitation of the substituted ammonium cation recited in instant claims 4, 7, 8, and 16. CA'367 exemplifies toners comprising 99 parts by weight of a toner binder resin and 1 part by weight of an IPEC. Example 1 at page 21, lines 15-17. The amounts of 99 parts by weight and 1 part by weight meet the amounts recited in instant claims 14, 15, and 21. According to CA'367, its IPEC possesses good charge control properties and high thermal stability. The IPEC has good dispersibility in customary toner, powder coating, and electret binders. Page 7, lines 19-22.

CA'367 does not exemplify a method of controlling or improving the charge of an electrophotographic toner or developer, a powder coating, or an electret comprising the step of adding the IPEC comprising hectorite or bentonite as the polyanion-forming compound and a polymeric ammonium salt, n,m-ionene, or poly(viologen) as the polycation-forming compound. However, as discussed above, CA'367 teaches that IPEC can comprise hectorite or bentonite as the polyanion-forming compound and the polymeric ammonium salt, n,m-ionene, or poly(viologen) as the polycation-forming compound.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings of CA'367, to use an inter-polyelectrolyte complex (IPEC) comprising hectorite or bentonite as the polyanion-forming compound and the polymeric ammonium salt, n,m-ionene, or poly(viologen) as the polycation-forming compound, as the IPEC in the method of controlling or improving the charge of the toner disclosed in example 1 of CA'367, because that person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic toner, a powder coating, or an electret material having good charging properties as taught by CA'367.

14. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

15. Claims 1, 4, 7-10, and 18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,030,738 (Michel'738).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter recited in the claims of Michel'738 render obvious the subject matter recited in the instant claims.

Reference claim 5, which depends from reference claim 1, recites a method of controlling and improving the charge of an electrophotographic toner or developer, a powder coating, or an electret material comprising the step of adding an inter-polyelectrolyte complex in an amount of from 0.01 to 50% by weight to the binder of the toner or developer, the powder coating, or electret material. Reference claim 1 recites that the polyelectrolyte complex comprises a polyanion-forming compound and a polycation-forming compound, wherein the polyanion-forming compound can be hectorite or bentonite. Reference claim 3, which depends from reference claim 1, recites that the polycation-forming compound can be a polymeric ammonium salt obtained by homopolymerizing monomers of the formula (I), a n,m-ionene, and a poly(viologen). Hectorite and bentonite meet the limitation of the silicate anion recited in the instant claims. The polymeric ammonium salt, n,m-ionene, and

poly(viologen) meet the limitation of the substituted ammonium cation recited in instant claims 4, 7, 8, and 16. Reference claim 7 recite toners comprising a particular binder resin and from 0.01 to 50 % by weight, based on the total weight of the toner, an inter-polyelectrolyte complex comprising a polycation-forming compound and a polyanion-forming compound, wherein the polyanion-forming compound can be a hectorite or bentonite.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the subject matter recited in the claims of Michel'738, to make and use an inter-polyelectrolyte complex (IPEC) comprising hectorite or bentonite as the polyanion-forming compound and a polymeric ammonium salt, n,m-ionene, or poly(viologen) as the polycation-forming compound, as the IPEC in the method of controlling or improving the charge recited in reference claim 5 and in the toner of reference claim 7 of Michel'738, because that person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic toner, a powder coating, or an electret material that has improved charging.

16. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janis L. Dote whose telephone number is (571) 272-1382. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Mark Huff, can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The central fax phone number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of papers not received regarding this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Supervisory Application Examiner Ms. Claudia Sullivan, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7874 and as of Dec. 22, 2003 (571) 272-1052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

JLD
December 17, 2003


JANIS L. DOTE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1500
1700